



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,448	06/19/2001	Kenneth J. Hines	10488/11:1	2736

7590 09/13/2004

MICHAEL R. BARRE
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

ROCHE, TRENTON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 09/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/885,448

Applicant(s)

HINES, KENNETH J.

Examiner

Trent J Roche

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-17 and 24-30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 18-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10102001, 01062003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communications filed 19 June 2001.
2. In a telephone message from the applicant's representative, Ed Taylor, on 24 August 2004 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-7 and 18-23. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 8-17 and 24-30 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.
3. Claims 1-7 and 18-23 have been examined.

Election/Restrictions

4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-7 and 8-23, drawn to a method and system of using a debugger in a simulator, classified in class 717, subclass 135.
 - II. Claims 8-12, drawn to a method for transforming a visual prototype into a behavioral expression, classified in class 717, subclass 109.
 - III. Claims 13-17 and 24-30, drawn to a method and tool for analyzing system events, classified in class 717, subclass 156.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

5. Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as

Art Unit: 2124

claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the claims in invention I merely discuss the act of using a debugger in a software system simulation to create and identify certain predetermined behavior, and do not discuss any aspects regarding the creation of a visual prototype to represent predetermined behaviors. The subcombination has separate utility such as outlining the details involved in creating a behavioral expression from a visual prototype, which would not include the various steps outlined in invention I.

6. Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, invention III has separate utility such as analyzing system events and creating a dependency graph to represent the system events, and does not perform the steps of creating a behavioral expression from a visual prototype. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claim1-7 and 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,965,743 to Malin et al, hereafter referred to as Malin.

Per claim 1:

Malin discloses:

Art Unit: 2124

- a method for debugging a software system (“the debug facility allows the user to turn debug on or off...” in col. 29 lines 8-9)
- the software system having a first and second software component (“Components are the basic building blocks in the invention used to represent the objects of the model” in col. 15 lines 52-53)
- and a first coordinator for implementing a predetermined coordination protocol, each of the first and second components connected to the coordinator by a respective pair of complimentary coordination interfaces (“VCs provide the mechanism...to connect a specific set of variables from a component to a specific set of variables in another component” in col. 17 lines 64-68)
- generating a record of software system events, each event record within the record of system events representing an inter-component control or dataflow interaction (“The results of the simulation can either be permanently recorded in a log file or debug text...” in col. 13 lines 34-36)
- creating a behavioral template based on a predetermined behavior of the software system (“the library designer is able to create the knowledge representation information that is needed for the creation of models and the simulation of such models” in col. 15 lines 44-47)
- identifying an occurrence of the predetermined behavior within the record of software system events, based on the behavioral template (“Additional analysis is obtained by comparison of log files to specify the differences in outcomes...” in col. 10 lines 52-53)

substantially as claimed.

Per claim 2:

Art Unit: 2124

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Malin discloses creating the behavioral template comprises creating a visual prototype, which represents the predetermined behavior of the software system as claimed (“This module allows the model builder to construct a model graphically...” in col. 24 lines 58-59)

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Malin discloses creating a behavior expression, which represents the predetermined behavior of the software system as claimed (“Statements are associated with processes...They are written in terms of the operators, component variables inherited from the VCs, and the values of the valueclasses defined in the language” in col. 24 lines 26-30)

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Malin discloses simulating an execution of the software system, with the record of software system events generated by the simulator as claimed (“The results of the simulation can either be permanently recorded in a log file or debug text...” in col. 13 lines 34-36)

Per claim 5

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Malin discloses instrumenting the software system to provide an event notification to a runtime operating system for each software system event, and deploying the software system to a target architecture, and capturing all notifications from the software system and storing the event notifications as claimed (Note Figure 1, item 132.1.

Art Unit: 2124

To perform a trace of the system, and for the Log file to have been created, the system inherently had instrumentation to provide event notification so that the events could be recorded. Further, the simulation is inherently running on a target architecture.)

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Malin discloses a predetermined set of state changes selected from an execution of the software system as claimed (“Discrete event modeling and simulation is characterized by state changes in a system’s entities, ‘events’, that occur...” in col. 4 lines 14-16)

Per claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Malin discloses a predetermined set of state changes and message events selected from an execution of the software system as claimed (“Discrete event modeling and simulation is characterized by state changes in a system’s entities, ‘events’, that occur...” in col. 4 lines 14-16)

Per claim 18:

Malin discloses:

- a software system design tool (“A specialized qualitative modeling and discrete event simulation tool...” in col. 10 lines 3-4)
- a simulator for simulating an execution of the software system (Note Figure 1, item 13 and the corresponding section of the disclosure)

Art Unit: 2124

- a template tool for creating a behavioral template based on a predetermined behavior of the software system (“the library designer is able to create the knowledge representation information that is needed for the creation of models and the simulation of such models” in col. 15 lines 44-47)
- a debugging tool for identifying an instance of the predetermined behavior of the software system from a simulated execution of the software system based on the behavioral template (“Additional analysis is obtained by comparison of log files to specify the differences in outcomes...” in col. 10 lines 52-53. Further, “the debug facility allows the user to turn debug on or off...” in col. 29 lines 8-9)

substantially as claimed.

Per claim 19:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 2.

Per claim 20:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 3.

Per claim 21:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, and further, Malin discloses the behavior of the software system comprises a predetermined set of software system events as claimed (“Discrete event modeling and simulation is characterized by state changes in a system’s entities, ‘events’, that occur...” in col. 4 lines 14-16)

Art Unit: 2124

Per claim 22:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 6.

Per claim 23:

The rejection of claim 18 is incorporated, and further, note the rejection regarding claim 7.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trent J Roche whose telephone number is (703)305-4627. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703)305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Trent J Roche
Examiner

Application/Control Number: 09/885,448

Page 9

Art Unit: 2124

Art Unit 2124

TJR

Kakali Chaki
KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100